

NCIE Brokerage Platform Evaluation

CUREE

1.1 Usability

The first page is crowded. Standard left-side menu, with sub-menus. A right-side box named *Have you seen?*, which highlight some of their content. Also a box called *Recently viewed*, which probably lists the articles last viewed on the site. The overall impression is that there is too much information on the front page.

1.2 Text on platform

There is a lot of text on the front page. It might be useful for first-time visitors, but probably annoying for frequent users.

1.3 Description of aims

A clear description of CUREE's aims are listed in the section *What we do*.

1.4 Organization of access to evidence

Very difficult to get to the evidence. The categories listed under "resources" in the left menu are mostly empty. The various maps are not hyperlinked and are of little use. The section at the bottom of the front page is a good feature, with tabs for the two target groups. Unclear why the articles are listed under the two tabs. Most recent, featured, or what? The presentation of articles are to-the-point, with relevant information, but keywords should also be provided.

1.5 Search options

There is only two search options, both are free text boxes. One seems to be for global searching the web site, the other for searching the evidence base.

1.6 Contact possibilities

Contact info easily available in a box on the front page.

1.7 Links to further information

There is a section called *Useful links*, where a comprehensive set of links to other resources is provided. These are divided into four categories.

2.1 Quality of outputs

The outputs are of a varying degree of abstraction.

2.2 Quality of audio/video content

Text resources only.

3 Features

The box on the front page, with two tabs: One for policy and one for practice. We should also might consider the box *Have you seen?* for highlighting specific articles. Two sections like *What we do* and *About us* should also be included in our portal.

Danish Clearinghouse for Educational Research

1.1 Usability

The evidence base is found deep within the structure of the website of the Danish School of Education. Very poor usability.

1.2 Text on platform

The text is sparse.

1.3 Description of aims

Very short description, but a link to a very comprehensive document (concept note) is provided.

1.4 Organization of access to evidence

The evidence can only be accessed by the means of a free-text search field (no browsing, for example).

1.5 Search options

Only free-text search box. This functionality does not even work!

1.6 Contact possibilities

Easily available, from the main page

1.7 Links to further information

Very little

2.1 Quality of outputs

Not possible to evaluate, as the only mechanism for accessing the material does not work

2.2 Quality of audio/video content

Same as above.

3 Features

None!

EPPI Centre

1.1 Usability

The main page is well organized, with easy access to the evidence library.

1.2 Text on platform

Short and to the point.

1.3 Description of aims

Described briefly on main page. Link to more information.

1.4 Organization of access to evidence

Easy access to the evidence library from the main page. Two sections, the *Knowledge pages* and the *Reviews search*. Access to the reviews are very well organized. It is possible to browse (in a tree structure) by pre-selected keywords, or browse by topic area, date, or reviews done by a particular group. The Knowledge Pages facility enables users to search for the key messages within specific subject areas to which EPPI-Centre reviews have contributed. The knowledge pages lists topics in alphabetical order.

1.5 Search options

In addition to the access mechanisms described above, there is only a free-text search box. No advanced search.

1.6 Contact possibilities

Easily accessible

1.7 Links to further information

Each review contains a list of the studies included in the review.

2.1 Quality of outputs

Very good. Each review is summarized in the following sections:

- What do we want to know?
- Who wants to know and why?
- What did we find?
- What are the implications
- How did we get these results?

In addition, most reviews have links to more information on the review group, a summary of the report, the full technical report, and references to the studies included in the review.

2.2 Quality of audio/video content

No such content

3 Features

The evidence base contains a very large amount of information, and it is very well structured. However, the LINKED portal will not by far be as complex as the EPPI-Centre, and we will probably not need all features provided here. I found the structuring of the review findings very interesting, and also the navigation feature where it is possible to browse the content according to pre-defined

keywords in a tree-structure. It is worth noting that the site does not provide an advanced search function, and do not distinguish between the two user groups policy and practice.